

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The final office action of November 14, 2006, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 7, 22, 32, and 47 have been amended, claims 44-46 and 53 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 62-65 have been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 7-9, 22-24, 32-43, 47-51, and 59-65 remain pending in this application. Entry of the amendments, reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Preliminarily, Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication that the application contains allowable subject matter. Specifically, claims 45 and 47 were deemed allowable if rewritten in independent form to incorporate all the features of their respective base claims and any intervening claims. Thus, to expedite allowance, Applicants have amended independent claim 32 to incorporate the subject matter of claims 44 and 45, and have converted claim 47 into an independent claim by incorporating all of the subject matter of pre-amended claim 32 and claim 46. Accordingly, Applicants believe that amended claims 32 and 47 are allowable over the art of record. Additionally, for reasons explained in more detail below, Applicants also believe the remaining claims are allowable.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 7-9, 22-24, 32-43, and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,016,869 (*Haeberli*), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,831,617 (*Bhukhanwala*). Claims 48 and 49, dependent from claim 32, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by *Haeberli* and *Bhukhanwala*, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,535,322 (*Hecht*). Claim 50, dependent from claim 32, stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by *Haeberli* and *Bhukhanwala*, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,781,635 (*Chan*). Claims 59-61, dependent from claim 32, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by *Haeberli* and *Bhukhanwala*, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,062,497 (*Hamburg*). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

As stated above, Applicants have amended independent claim 32 to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claims 44 and 45, and have converted allowable claim 47 into an

independent claim by incorporating all of the subject matter of pre-amended claim 32 and claim 46. Accordingly, Applicants believe that amended claims 32 and 47 are allowable over the art of record. Claims 33-43, 48-51, and 59-61 depend from claim 32 and are allowable for at least the same reasons, as well as based on the additional features recited therein.

Independent claim 7, a method for synchronizing multiple versions of an object, has been similarly amended to incorporate all of the subject matter of allowable claim 45 as well as intervening claim 44. Accordingly, Applicants believe that amended claim 7 is also allowable over the art of record, along with dependent claims 8 and 9.

Independent claim 22 recites a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the steps identical to those of claim 7, and has been similarly amended to incorporate all of the subject matter of allowable claim 45 as well as intervening claim 44. Accordingly, Applicants believe that amended claim 22 is also allowable over the art of record, along with dependent claims 23 and 24.

New Claims

Applicants request entry of the additional claims as not requiring further search and/or consideration as they contain subject matter identified as allowable as set forth below.

Independent claim 62, a method for synchronizing multiple versions of an object, recites steps identical to those of claim 7 as amended above and also recites all of the subject matter of allowable claim 47 and intervening claim 46. Accordingly, Applicants believe that new claim 62 is also allowable over the art of record for the same reasons discussed above.

Independent claim 63 recites a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the steps identical to those of claim 22 as amended above and includes the subject matter of allowable claim 47 and intervening claim 46. Accordingly, Applicants believe that new claim 63 is also allowable over the art of record for the same reasons discussed above.

Independent claim 64 recites a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the steps identical to those of claim 32 as amended above. Accordingly, Applicants believe that new claim 64 is also allowable over the art of record for the same reasons discussed above.

Independent claim 65 recites a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the steps identical to those of amended claim 47. Accordingly, Applicants believe that new claim 64 is also allowable over the art of record for the same reasons discussed above.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3223.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated this 18th day of January 2007

By: /Gary D. Fedorochko/
Gary D. Fedorochko
Reg. No. 35,509

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001